**IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD**

**SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No. 22152 of 2007**
**WITH**
**SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 22153 of 2007**
**TO**
**SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 22162 of 2007**

**For Approval and Signature:**

**HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE AKSHAY H.MEHTA**

==========

1 Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?

2 To be referred to the Reporter or not ?

3 Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgment ?

4 Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the constitution of India, 1950 or any order made thereunder ?

5 Whether it is to be circulated to the civil judge ?

==========

**AMARSINH DEEPSINH PARMAR - Petitioner(s)**
**Versus**
**STATE OF GUJARAT & 2 - Respondent(s)**

==========

**Appearance : [SCA NOS. 22152 to 22157 of 2007]**

MR SP MAJMUDAR for Petitioner(s) : 1,
MR SS SHAH, GP for Respondent(s) : 1,

MR RM CHHAYA for Respondent – 2,
MR RR MARSHALL for Respondent(s) : 3.

**Appearance : [SCA NOS. 22158 to 22162 of 2007]**

MR SP MAJMUDAR for Petitioner(s) : 1,
MR NEERAJ SONI, AGP for Respondent(s) : 1,

MR RM CHHAYA for Respondent – 2,
MR RR MARSHALL for Respondent(s) : 3.

==========

**CORAM : HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE AKSHAY H.MEHTA**

**Date : 18/09/2007**

**ORAL COMMON JUDGMENT** :

1. **RULE**. Service of rule is waived by Mr. Neeraj Soni, Ld. AGP on behalf of respondents no. 1, Mr. RM Chhaya, learned advocate for respondent no. 2 and Mr. RR Marshall, learned advocate for respondent no. 3. With the consent of the parties, the matter is taken up for final hearing today itself. All these petitions involve the same set of facts, therefore, they are heard together and they are now being disposed of by this common judgment.

2. The grievance of the petitioners is that their agricultural lands have been acquired by the respondents, but they have not been paid compensation for the crop as well as trees grown on the said lands. It is also the say of the petitioners that in pursuance of the policy of the respondents, the land users like the petitioners are required to be given employment by the acquiring body like respondent no. 3. However, that has also not been done. Hence, these petitions.

3. I have heard Mr. S.P. Majmudar learned advocate for the petitioners and Mr. SS Shah, Ld. GP, Mr. Neeraj Soni learned A.G.P., appearing for respondents no. 1, Mr. RM Chhaya, learned advocate for respondent no. 2 and Mr. Marshall learned advocate for respondent no. 3. I have carefully perused the record of these petitions. It appears from it that for the present the reliefs as prayed for in the petitions cannot be granted by this

Court. However, the petitioners can make appropriate representations to the concerned authority for redressal of their grievance. In view of the same, the following directions:-

3.1. The petitioners if they so chose, can make representations to the concerned respondents within 15 days of this judgment. In the representation they can request the respondents for grant of both the reliefs. As and when the representations are received by the respondents, they will take appropriate decision thereon within two months from the receipt of the representations. The petitioners may select one of them as their representative, who can remain present before the respondents and put forward their case to them. The respondents will grant personal hearing to the representative of the petitioners and the date of hearing will be intimated to the representative of the petitioners at least one week prior to the date of hearing. The decision that may be taken on the representations, may be intimated to the petitioners within 15 days from the date of the decision. The petitioners are granted liberty to approach this Court in case the decision is adversely affecting them.

4. Rule is made absolute to the aforesaid extent with no order as to costs. Considering the facts of the case, direct service is permitted.

[Akshay H. Mehta, J.]

* Pansala.